



# CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

May 17, 2001

## **H.R. 1699** **Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2001**

*As ordered reported by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure  
on May 16, 2001*

### **SUMMARY**

H.R. 1699 would authorize the appropriation of \$4.4 billion for discretionary programs of the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) for fiscal year 2002, including about \$3.7 billion for operating expenses, \$659 million for acquisition and other capital projects, \$22 million for research activities, \$15 million for bridge alterations, and \$17 million for environmental compliance. (For fiscal year 2001, appropriations for these programs totaled \$3.7 billion.) Of the amounts authorized, \$48.5 million would be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF). In addition, H.R. 1699 would authorize the appropriation of \$876 million for Coast Guard retirement benefits in 2002.

The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 1699 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would have no impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

### **ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

The estimated budgetary effects of the bill are summarized in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 300 (natural resources and environment) and 400 (transportation).

|   | By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars |       |       |      |      |      |
|---|--|-------|-------|------|------|------|
|   | 2001                                   | 2002  | 2003  | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
| <b>SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION</b>          |  |       |       |      |      |      |
| USCG Spending Under Current Law                   |  |       |       |      |      |      |
| Budget Authority/Authorization Level <sup>a</sup> | 3,652                                  | 29    | 0     | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                                 | 3,766                                  | 1,010 | 452   | 278  | 137  | 23   |
| Proposed Changes                                  |  |       |       |      |      |      |
| Authorization Level                               | 0                                      | 4,367 | 0     | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                                 | 0                                      | 3,073 | 755   | 285  | 150  | 46   |
| USCG Spending Under H.R. 1699                     |  |       |       |      |      |      |
| Authorization Level <sup>a</sup>                  | 3,652                                  | 4,396 | 0     | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                                 | 3,766                                  | 4,083 | 1,207 | 563  | 287  | 69   |

a. The 2001 level is the amount appropriated for that year. The \$29 million in 2002 is the amount already authorized to be appropriated from the OSLTF for Coast Guard operating expenses and research.

The amount authorized by the bill for Coast Guard retirement has not been included in the above table because such pay is an entitlement under current law and it is not subject to appropriation actions.

## **BASIS OF ESTIMATE**

For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 1699 will be enacted during fiscal year 2001, and that the amounts authorized for USCG programs will be appropriated for fiscal year 2002.

The authorization level for 2002 is the amount stated in the bill for discretionary accounts, excluding \$28.5 million of the \$48.5 million to be derived from the OSLTF. (This amount, which consists of \$25 million for Coast Guard operations and \$3.5 million for research, has been excluded because such funding is already authorized under existing law.) Outlays are estimated on the basis of historical spending patterns for Coast Guard programs.

**PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS:** None.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT**

H.R. 1699 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would have no impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

**ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:**

Federal Costs: Deborah Reis

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Victoria Heid Hall

Impact on the Private Sector: Lauren Marks

**ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:**

Robert A. Sunshine

Assistant Director for Budget Analysis